DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 421 479 SP 038 052

AUTHOR Glassford, Larry A.
TITLE Meeting the Needs of Future Teachers: Curricular Changes for Preservice Programs from Implications of Secondary Teachers' Perceptions of Recent Changes in Ontario Schools.
PUB DATE 1997-06-00
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Association for Teacher Education (St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada, June 1997).
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Development; *Educational Change; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Secondary Education; *Secondary School Teachers; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Ontario

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses how preservice teacher education programs can be improved to better service teacher candidates. This paper examines a study of teachers from nine Ontario secondary schools regarding the impact of change on their work lives. The study involved 130 survey questionnaires and 45 structured interviews. This paper focuses on information from teachers with at least 10 years of experience (36 questionnaires and 12 interviews) to determine indications of particular success or failure in dealing with change that might be traced to their initial preservice education programs. More than three out of five teachers did not have pleasant experiences with change in their profession. Just over 51 percent agreed that teachers were unprepared for change, and about 75 percent believed that teachers were not in control of change. Just over 52 percent believed that change made teaching less satisfying. Almost 62 percent agreed that change had a negative impact on time allocation and use. About 84 percent agreed that change in the years ahead will transform the work lives of teachers. Despite largely negative personal encounters with change to their professional lives, these teachers fully realized that major innovations and alterations were coming. Comparison of teachers with less than 10 years and more than 10 years of experience showed a few variations, though in most categories the responses were similar. Fewer of the newer teachers felt unprepared for change or that change made teaching less satisfying. (Contains 5 tables of questionnaire response percentages and 12 references.) (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 421 479

MEETING THE NEEDS OF FUTURE TEACHERS:

Curricular Changes for Preservice Programs from Implications of Secondary Teachers' Perceptions of Recent Changes in Ontario Schools

by

Larry A. Glassford

Faculty of Education

University of Windsor

A Symposium Paper Delivered to the Canadian Association for Teacher Education

Annual Meeting in St. John's, Newfoundland

June 1997

SP038052

L. Glassford

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Meeting the Needs of Future Teachers:

Curricular Changes for Preservice Programs from Implications of

Secondary Teachers' Perceptions of Recent Changes in Ontario Schools

Background

In 1993, Michael Fullan was asked by an interviewer from *Education Forum*, a magazine published by the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation, "How will graduates from faculties of education help us with change?" At the time, such graduates were having great difficulty in even finding employment in their field, let alone changing it, but the question was interesting for the angle it took on the oft-discussed issue of educational reform. "We have a pool of persons with great potential, but I don't think we are doing enough about getting their careers started well," Dr. Fullan replied. "Teachers individually and in combination should be the change agents of the future" (Wright, 1993, p. 17). These, the final words of the interview, presented an intriguing question. How well does preservice teacher education prepare graduating teacher candidates for a field (and a world) dominated by change?

To judge by recent literature on the subject, the answer is 'not very well'! Birch and Elliott, for example, argue on the basis of their survey of relevant research studies that "existing teacher education programs have worked to maintain the status quo" (1993, p.366). Far from producing highly-trained, self-confident change agents, the preservice experience actually serves an apprenticeship function that socializes new teachers to the existing cultural norms and practices of an essentially conservative profession. "Bridging the gap between theory and

practice has long been a goal of faculties and colleges of education," David Mandzuk has recently pointed out, "(but) it is as elusive today as it has been in the past" (1995, p. 389). The need to provide student teachers with a survival kit for the short term invariably clashes with the need to equip them with the attitudes, skills and conceptual knowledge that might produce critical-thinking, action-researching innovators in the long term. The dilemma is not peculiar to this country or continent. Basing their conclusions on research into the attitudes toward change of Australian teachers, Churchill and Williamson have noted a similar degree of frustration with teacher education in that part of the world. "Preservice teacher training programs should reflect a much broader conception of teachers' work," they have stated. "Many teachers feel unprepared, unwilling or unskilled in and for the roles they occupy in their responses to change initiatives and directives" (1997, p.13). Preservice teacher education, it would seem, is not all it could be regardless of its format or locale.

Research Findings

This paper draws upon findings of a study that sought information from teachers of nine secondary schools in southwestern Ontario regarding the impact of change on their worklives. A combination of survey questionnaires and structured interviews was utilized. In all, 130 two-page questionnaires were completed, as well as 45 one-hour teacher interviews. For the purposes of this paper, an additional focus has been those teachers within the larger surveys who have up to ten years of experience in the field. The responses of this sub-group (36 questionnaires and 12 interviews) have been sifted for any indications of particular success, or failure, in dealing with

change that might be traced to their initial preservice education programs. In other words, how well did their B. Ed. experience prepare them for coping with, adapting to, implementing and/or managing significant educational change?

The overall results of the survey's eight questions which elicited respondents' views concerning the impact of change on the teaching profession are shown in Table One. The response scale consisted of 5 points, with a "3" indicating the respondent was neutral, unsure or perhaps indifferent as between two polarized answers that were suggested for the question. Table Two collapses the responses for "1" and "2" into one category, and "4" and "5" into a second category. Response "3" remains the neutral middle category. This procedure, by combining those of some agreement and those of strong agreement with a given statement into a single category, permits more effective comparison with those other responses on the other end of the scale that showed support, either limited or strong, for the contrary statement.

The teacher respondents in this survey have generally not had pleasant experiences with change in their profession. More than three out of five (61.5%) reported that "change has made it more difficult to meet students' needs," as compared to the 14.5% who agreed with the statement that "change has made it much easier for teachers to meet students' needs." (The remainder - 23.8% of respondents - opted for the neutral "3" response). There was more ambivalence in the answers to the next question about the impact of change on their students. About a quarter of respondents (26.9%) felt that change had generally been "beneficial for students," while just fewer than half (44.6%) felt it had not been beneficial for students.

The next question dealt with teachers' degree of preparedness for change. By a slim majority (51.6%), respondents indicated their agreement with the statement that "teachers are

unprepared for change." Slightly fewer than one-quarter of those surveyed believed that teachers are "well prepared for change." When it came to the question of teachers controlling change, however, the responses indicated a near consensus. Almost three-quarters (74.6%) of respondents supported the statement that "teachers are not in control of change." Of those surveyed, nearly half (43.8%) opted for a strong endorsement of the statement by circling response "5." By contrast, only 11.6% showed support for the contrary position by circling responses "1" or "2."

By a small majority (52.3%), the respondents indicated agreement with the statement that "change has made teaching less satisfying." Almost one in five (19.2%), however, endorsed the opposing sentiment. By a similar proportion (20.0%), a minority of respondents indicated that "change has enhanced teachers' professionalism." Just over one-third of respondents supported the idea that change has "detracted from" teachers' professionalism. The largest group (42.3%) chose to remain neutral on this question.

Question Seven produced a high level of agreement (61.6%) for the position that "change has had a negative impact on time allocation and use." Only one-quarter as many respondents (15.3%) supported the opposite contention, that change had had a "positive impact" on time allocation and use. Nevertheless, by an overwhelming majority (83.8%), more than four out of five of these teachers agreed with the statement that "change in the years ahead will transform the work lives of teachers." Despite largely negative personal encounters with change to their professional lives, then, these teachers fully realized that major innovations and alterations were coming, whether welcome or not.

Tables Three and Four provide the questionnaire responses of a subset of the total group

of respondents - namely, those with ten or fewer years of teaching experience. As with the larger group discussed above, a breakdown of responses in five categories is shown first (Table Three), and then the collapsed categories are presented (Table Four). There are no earthshaking departures from the overall pattern, although a few interesting variations do emerge. By generally similar proportions to the overall group, the less experienced teachers agreed that change has made it "more difficult to meet students' needs," that teachers are "not in control of change," that change has had a "negative impact" on time allocation and use, and that change in the years ahead will "transform" the work lives of teachers. As was the case with their more experienced colleagues, these secondary-school teachers responded somewhat ambivalently to the questions concerning whether change had been "beneficial" for the students, and whether change had "enhanced" or "detracted from" teachers' professionalism.

Table Five presents a more explicit comparison of the less experienced and more experienced teachers for Questions Three and Five. While a clear majority (56.4%) of the veteran teachers felt that "teachers are unprepared for change," this margin becomes a much narrower plurality (38.9%) for the teachers with 10 or fewer years of experience. A marked contrast between veterans and newer teachers also shows up on the question of attitudes to change. Nearly three in five (58.5%) of the former category agreed that change has made teaching "less satisfying," whereas barely more than one-third of the latter felt this way. While overall numbers in the sample are insufficient to reach definitive conclusions, these contrasts are suggestive. Possibly because fewer of the newer teachers feel "unprepared for change," fewer of them are prepared to say that change has made teaching "less satisfying." Even if there is no cause-and-effect relationship between the two factors, it does seem clear that veteran teachers in

the survey were more inclined to feel both that teachers are "unprepared for change" (56.4% vs. 38.9%), and that "change has made teaching less satisfying" (58.5% vs. 36.1%).

It is not clear from this comparison whether to attribute the difference in responses to more effective preparation of newer teachers in B. Ed. Programs, or to a generational phenomenon. Younger teachers may simply be more flexible in their habits and outlook than older teachers with a longer-standing commitment to tradition and the status quo. The questionnaire survey does not shed any more light on this question, but an examination of the personal interviews conducted with newer members of the profession does offer some interesting insights.

Among the questions in the in-depth interview was one which asked, "What were the things that impeded you in your efforts to implement the change?" The dozen respondents with 10 or fewer years of experience listed fairly standard hindrances to change such as organizational inertia, lack of direction, inadequate resources, insufficient time, and resistance from parents, students and colleagues - generally the same factors cited by the more experienced teachers in the survey. (Half of the twelve interviewees felt negative toward the specific change they cited as an example upon which to base the interview, while the other half felt positive). Another question asked about "the things that helped you implement the change." Most commonly cited was the collegial aid of fellow teachers, followed by specific professional development or inservicing initiatives, such as training workshops and background resource materials. What no one mentioned was the beneficial impact of their preservice teacher education, although one interviewed teacher did cite an inservice course from the local Faculty of Education as "very helpful." The twelve interviewees being looked at here ranged from three

to ten years' experience, so it is not surprising that references to the B. Ed. Program are not overwhelming. However, the total absence of comment should be cause for concern. Their preservice training was apparently irrelevant to these newer teachers in their struggles to implement or cope with a significant educational change affecting their students and their own work lives.

Several questions elicited information from the interviewees concerning the nature of their encounter with change. Many of the problems mentioned were not surprising: heightened levels of stress, increased demands on already scarce time, frustration at the lack of consultation from higher-ups, and divisions within the teaching staff between those who embraced a change, and those who resisted it. However, several of these same teachers mentioned ancillary benefits of the change process. "It has made me a better teacher," said one, in discussing the implementation of new evaluation guidelines. Another referred to a "positive anxiety" associated with the change experience. A third teacher cited staff unification "from meeting similar challenges," while acknowledging that there was still "lots of complaining." A fourth interviewee pointed out that the scarcity of time was an encouragement to "work smarter, not harder" by for example, being "more pro-active with parents." A fifth respondent cited "more consultation with colleagues" and "improved political sensitivity in dealing with senior administration" as beneficial side-effects of implementing a controversial government-mandated change called Transition Years. "It encouraged me to be a better decision maker and risk taker," said this seventh-year teacher. In a similar vein, another respondent credited the generally negative encounter with change for helping to discern "how assertive I should be."

Near the end of the interview, each participating teacher was encouraged to reflect on the

lessons learned from a recent experience with the change process. Many of the comments point to a failure by policy-makers and senior administrators to take seriously the sage advice about change implementation from Michael Fullan, whose widely-cited book, *The Meaning of Educational Change* (1982), was based upon a comprehensive review of research studies over several decades, and published fifteen years ago. For example, a teacher with 9 years' experience stated, "As a professional, I feel I should be part of the process of change, (but) few teachers are consulted." "If a change is to take place," said a 10-year veteran, "you need to 'pilot' it." "We need to speak up," said a third teacher, also with 10 years' experience. "Lots of work has gone in," explained a third-year teacher, who confessed to feeling "somewhat negative" about the implementation of change, "but we've seen no feedback or direction from input." This latter comment may offer some perspective on the next observation, from a teacher in a different school." It is surprising that so many people feel negative about the process of change," said this survivor of seven years in teaching, "and about means of learning how to implement new ideas." Another teacher, a ten-year veteran whose overall experience of change was "positive," acknowledged the necessity of finding people "willing to be open to the changes," but went on to confess that "at times you are overwhelmed by change."

Finally, what can be learned from the following offhand comment of one in the group? Upon reflection this 9-year teacher stated that it was "more difficult to implement new changes." At first, the expression "new changes" seems a simple example of word redundancy. Surely change is, by definition, new. But perhaps it was not a redundancy. Some change ideas have been around for a long time. Never fully implemented, frequently recycled as familiar elixir in shiny new containers, sometimes removed from one shelf only to be placed on another, such

"innovations" at least have the virtue of familiarity. The benefits and drawbacks of implementation are reasonably predictable. "New" change, however, is more frightening. Teachers are thrust into unfamiliar territory, with little preparation or support, and yet held accountable for the success of the change as well as the continuing welfare and progress of their students. Little wonder, then, that many of them echo the cautious sentiment of "Garth" in the recent hit movie, *Wayne's World*, who admitted, "We fear change."

What does it all mean? Newer teachers in the profession are somewhat more open to change than their seniors, whether due to naivete, training or the exuberance of (relative) youth. At the same time, they are unable to point to any specific aspect of their B. Ed. program that helped prepare them for a rapidly changing profession. They have already learned through the school of hard knocks what researchers have known for some time, but what policy-makers and senior administrators seem not to know, namely that the successful implementation of change requires the informed consent, trained support and dedicated participation of the front-line implementers - in this case, of the classroom teachers. Any meaningful changes to student outcomes must begin here.

Implications for Preservice Programs

Change and its sibling, continuity, have always been the siamese twins of human historical experience. This is not news; this is life. Without continuity, one could not recognize change; without change, continuity would be a superfluous word. Our species has always lived in a world of change, made bearable by the comforting rhythm of continuity. Each new day is

connected to both past and future. The seasons come and go in a more or less predictable pattern. Each life is unique, but the flow of that life still follows the "many parts" articulated by the Shakespearean character, Jacques, in the famous soliloquy, "All the world's a stage," from *As You Like* It (Clark & Wright, n.d.). What is new about change in the overall picture, as we approach the next millennium, is its rapid pace. Alvin Toffler coined the phrase "future shock" to describe a syndrome that would face human beings as they moved into an era of accelerating change (1970). What preservice teacher education must do is prepare the next generation of teachers, not just to survive, but to thrive in a world of rapid change.

Thriving in such a world implies much more than simply embracing each change as it comes by. Change and progress are not synonyms. Some change ideas are bad - wasteful, flawed, incredibly stupid, perhaps even dangerous concoctions. Yet they may be marketed with all the vigour and skill one would wish reserved for the genuinely good innovations - the ones that will improve the teaching-learning dynamic, lessen wasteful effort and maximize positive outcomes for our students. The well-prepared beginning teacher, then, must be able to think clearly, critically and contextually, placing new, or apparently new, ideas about education in a broader historical and sociological perspective. Recognizing 'improvement' necessitates a familiarity both with what was and is, and also with what might or should be. Furthermore, it implies the ability to move between the theoretical world of exciting ideas and noble ideals, on the one hand, and the practical world of crowded classrooms, antiquated learning materials, late-night marking sessions, rewarding but fatiguing extra-curricular supervision, confusing curriculum guidelines and contradictory community expectations, on the other. The key question becomes, how can our B. Ed. programs be improved to better serve our teacher candidates and their future

students?

The discussion might begin with a discussion of who gets into teacher education. Most programs in this country have a primary emphasis on academic achievement, with other factors such as an experience profile, a personal interview and designated-minority inclusion receiving some consideration in the overall picture. Regardless of the relative emphasis of the latter factors at particular institutions, the major common element is an insistence upon acceptable grades. Given that B. Ed. curriculum loads, whether concurrent or consecutive, already seem crowded, and given that adding another year to them may not be financially feasible for either students or governments, it may be that programs should consider requiring more course prerequisites prior to admission. Certainly, there is support for the notion that "a sound liberal education" (Birch & Elliott, 1993) is a necessary foundation for the kind of adaptable, morally secure, critical-thinking instructor we seek for our schools. This implies a thorough exposure to history, as well as a cross-section of social sciences and humanities. An in-depth understanding of the human condition is just as vital as literacy, numeracy or computer skills for the novice teacher.

Once in a B. ED. program, the aspiring teachers have a continuing need for such liberal arts instruction, now more focused on the professional field they hope to enter. Frequently referred to as the foundation courses, these subjects should continue to encompass the history, philosophy, politics, economics, sociology and psychology of education. In recent years, many Canadian institutions have succumbed to a well-meaning trend toward emphasis upon the short-term and practical over the long-term and conceptual (Taylor & Miller, 1985). This may be unavoidable in programs that deliberately emphasize hands-on classroom experience, but it also

guarantees that most graduates will not have a developed base for ongoing reflection that could link practice to its conceptual roots. While no one wishes to send unprepared teacher candidates into the 'real world' of today's classrooms because of an undue bias toward ivory-tower theory, neither is it advisable to focus the entire teacher education program on teacher tips and practitioner proverbs, leavened by a superficial exposure to the latest trendy models and panaceas. The key is to find the appropriate balance between the "warm" and the "demanding" conditions set out by Roberts and Clifton (1995, pp. 372-3) as indicators of effective instruction. Novice teachers require both a 'survival kit' of classroom techniques, and a solid foundation of enduring big-picture ideas, theories and models which will permit them to connect the challenges and frustrations of their own teaching experiences to the main currents of educational thought. The 'survival kit' supports the novice teachers in the short run; the enduring ideas should demand that they think hard about what they are doing, and why they are doing it.

The same principles apply in both the curriculum methods courses and the teaching practicum, two other mainstays of conventional teacher education in Canada. The student teachers, mindful of what faces them in their immediate future, want the practical teaching techniques that will enable them to survive practice teaching, land a job offer, and earn a permanent contract. In the medium to long-term, they will need the broader base which exposure to the history and theory of curriculum and instruction will afford them, if they are to maximize their potential as the positive "change agents" Fullan envisions. Yet, as Geddis and Onslow reiterate, "Neither academics nor practitioners focus much attention on how theory might inform practice" (1997, p. 19). Perhaps it is a step in the right direction simply to acknowledge the inherent tension between practice and theory, between 'now' and 'later,' and to resolve that

student teachers will continue to be exposed to both short-term and long-term perspectives in curriculum and methods courses in something like an equal balance. Moreover, later in-service training will be more successful, if there is a pre-service base from which to work.

In the recent past, much of the emphasis on integrating theory with practice has focused on practice teaching, however this hands-on experience is structured in particular institutions. The results have been decidedly discouraging, in part because of the typically hectic atmosphere in the host schools. As Birch and Elliott point out, "time for reflection, opportunities for peer observations, and encouragement of experimentation do not normally characterize the school" (1993, p. 372). One might even argue that placement in a school characterized by calm and placid teachers, pioneering novel approaches in a reflective yet experimental atmosphere, nurtured by a supportive administration with input from selflessly dedicated parent volunteers would fail the reality test. What graduate could ever hope to teach in such a shangri-la? Why prepare for utopia, when the jobs are elsewhere?

The dilemma goes beyond the model-school debate, however. Many have argued that the real purpose of the entire preservice program is, quite frankly, to socialize prospective teachers to the existing norms and values of an established profession. "The student teaching experience," Taylor and Miller assert, "serves to introduce and initiate the prospective teacher into the conventional wisdom" (1985, p. 118). This is not all bad . . . consider the alternative. Nevertheless, if positive change is the goal, then the status quo is a barrier to be overcome. It does no good to underestimate the difficulties inherent in such an endeavour. As Andy Hargreaves noted some years ago, "this culture of teaching, with its privileging of classroom experience, presents such an historically entrenched obstacle to educational innovation that any

policy of simple exhortation to teachers to draw on and accept wider experience and perspectives is unlikely to prove effective" (1984, p. 252). Again, within conventional preservice programs, it may be that the best one can hope for is to establish a framework of reflective practice that might endure the hurly burly of the first couple of years of new teachers' careers. Once initial survival in the profession is more or less assured, there might be a base for ongoing constructive teacher development of the sort advocated by Fullan and Hargreaves (1992). Beginning teachers must at least see a vision of the ideal, or else why would they expend scarce time and energy later in their careers in pursuit of fundamental changes to the ways that they serve their students? Sub-cultures the world over have proven remarkably persistent in this twentieth century, remarkably resistant to rationally based, top-down reform efforts. The established sub-culture of professional teaching in this country is no less conservative, no less entrenched in the school staffrooms and professional associations across the land. Yet that is where real change must take place, if it is to endure.

It is not the purpose of this paper to paint a picture of radical reforms to the existing preservice teacher education programs. For one thing, the external climate for 'big' changes is not propitious. For example, a movement in the early 1990s to add a second year to the consecutive B. Ed. programs in Ontario fell victim to the cost-cutting priorities of a new provincial government. Lengthening either the consecutive or concurrent programs across Canada by a year would not, of itself, represent radical change. It could provide time to deliver a fuller exposure to the foundations and curriculum methods of education. It could provide more time for in-school apprenticeship training, sometimes referred to as mentoring. While lengthening the program could well be a positive development, and in keeping with the tone of

this paper's recommendations, it is essentially more of the same. Same old same old, in today's jargon. Yet where is the genuinely new, that is also going to be genuinely better than what we have? Throwing student teachers into the schools for an extended period before they take their foundation and theory courses simply sets them adrift in a sea of conventional wisdom without a compass. Not much prospect for progressive change there, but a lot of reinvented wheels, perhaps. Keeping them from being tainted by the imperfect reality of actual schools until they have been pumped chock full of theories, models and paradigm shifts simply ensures that relatively few will find real jobs - the nautical image here is 'up a creek without a paddle' - fewer will keep them, and those few will mostly resent and belittle their 'useless' teacher ed. training. Inevitably, one seems driven back to the imperfect compromises built into most current presevice programs.

Better ideas anyone?

TABLE ONE

Questionnaire Responses of all Teachers by Category Percentages

1. Overall,
   change has made it more difficult . . . . . change has made it much easier for
   to meet students' needs teachers to meet students' needs
   1 = **23.8%** 2 = **37.7%** 3 = **23.8%** 4 = **13.8%** 5 = **0.8%**

2. Overall,
   change has generally been very . . . . . change has generally not been
   beneficial for students beneficial for students
   1 = **3.1%** 2 = **23.8%** 3 = **28.5%** 4 = **33.1%** 5 = **11.5%**

3. In general,
   teachers are well prepared for . . . . . teachers are unprepared for
   change change
   1 = **6.9%** 2 = **16.2%** 3 = **25.4%** 4 = **36.2%** 5 = **15.4%**

4. In general,
   teachers are in control of . . . . . teachers are not in control of
   change change
   1 = **5.4%** 2 = **6.2%** 3 = **13.8%** 4 = **30.8%** 5 = **43.8%**

5. In general,
   change has made teaching more . . . . . change has made teaching less
   satisfying satisfying
   1 = **4.6%** 2 = **14.6%** 3 = **28.5%** 4 = **30.8%** 5 = **21.5%**

6. In general,
   change has enhanced . . . . . change has detracted from
   teachers' professionalism teachers' professionalism
   1 = **3.8%** 2 = **16.2%** 3 = **42.3%** 4 = **23.1%** 5 = **14.6%**

7. In general,
   change has had a positive impact . . . . . change has had a negative impact
   on time allocation and use on time allocation and use
   1 = **1.5%** 2 = **13.8%** 3 = **23.1%** 4 = **36.2%** 5 = **25.4%**

8. I anticipate that
   change in the years ahead will . . . . . change in the years ahead will
   transform the work lives of teachers have only a minute effect on the
   work lives of teachers
   1 = **44.6%** 2 = **39.2%** 3 = **10.8%** 4 = **3.1%** 5 = **2.3%**

(N = 130)

TABLE TWO

Questionnaire Responses of all Teachers by Collapsed Categories

1. Overall,
   change has made it more difficult to meet students' needs . . . . . change has made it much easier for teachers to meet students' needs
   1 & 2 = **61.5%** 3 = **23.8%** 4 & 5 = **14.5%**

2. Overall,
   change has generally been very beneficial for students . . . . . change has generally not been beneficial for students
   1 & 2 = **26.9%** 3 = **28.5%** 4 & 5 = **44.6%**

3. In general,
   teachers are well prepared for change . . . . . teachers are unprepared for change
   1 & 2 = **23.1%** 3 = **25.4%** 4 & 5 = **51.6%**

4. In general,
   teachers are in control of change . . . . . teachers are not in control of change
   1 & 2 = **11.6%** 3 = **13.8%** 4 & 5 = **74.6%**

5. In general,
   change has made teaching more satisfying . . . . . change has made teaching less satisfying
   1 & 2 = **19.2%** 3 = **28.5%** 4 & 5 = **52.3%**

6. In general,
   change has enhanced teachers' professionalism . . . . . change has detracted from teachers' professionalism
   1 & 2 = **20.0%** 3 = **42.3%** 4 & 5 = **37.7%**

7. In general,
   change has had a positive impact on time allocation and use . . . . . change has had a negative impact on time allocation and use
   1 & 2 = **15.3%** 3 = **23.1%** 4 & 5 = **61.6%**

8. I anticipate that
   change in the years ahead will transform the work lives of teachers . . . . . change in the years ahead will have only a minute effect on the work lives of teachers
   1 & 2 = **83.8%** 3 = **10.8%** 4 & 5 = **5.4%**

(N = 130)

TABLE THREE

Questionnaire Responses of Newer Teachers by Category Percentages

1. Overall,
   change has made it more difficult to meet students' needs ..... change has made it much easier for teachers to meet students' needs
   1 = **22.2%** 2 = **41.7%** 3 = **27.8%** 4 = **8.3%** 5 = **0.0%**

2. Overall,
   change has generally been very beneficial for students ..... change has generally not been beneficial for students
   1 = **2.8%** 2 = **19.4%** 3 = **30.6%** 4 = **41.7%** 5 = **5.6%**

3. In general,
   teachers are well prepared for change ..... teachers are unprepared for change
   1 = **8.3%** 2 = **16.7%** 3 = **36.1%** 4 = **36.1%** 5 = **2.8%**

4. In general,
   teachers are in control of change ..... teachers are not in control of change
   1 = **8.3%** 2 = **5.6%** 3 = **19.4%** 4 = **33.3%** 5 = **33.3%**

5. In general,
   change has made teaching more satisfying ..... change has made teaching less satisfying
   1 = **8.3%** 2 = **22.2%** 3 = **33.3%** 4 = **22.2%** 5 = **13.9%**

6. In general,
   change has enhanced teachers' professionalism ..... change has detracted from teachers' professionalism
   1 = **2.8%** 2 = **19.4%** 3 = **50.0%** 4 = **25.0%** 5 = **2.8%**

7. In general,
   change has had a positive impact on time allocation and use ..... change has had a negative impact on time allocation and use
   1 = **0.0%** 2 = **16.7%** 3 = **33.3%** 4 = **33.3%** 5 = **16.7%**

8. I anticipate that
   change in the years ahead will transform the work lives of teachers ..... change in the years ahead will have only a minute effect on the work lives of teachers
   1 = **47.2%** 2 = **33.3%** 3 = **11.1%** 4 = **5.6%** 5 = **2.8%**

(N = 36)

TABLE FOUR

Questionnaire Responses of Newer Teachers by Collapsed Categories

1. Overall,
   change has made it more difficult to meet students' needs . . . . . change has made it much easier for teachers to meet students' needs
   1 & 2 = **63.9%** 3 = **27.8%** 4 & 5 = **8.3%**

2. Overall,
   change has generally been very beneficial for students . . . . . change has generally not been beneficial for students
   1 & 2 = **22.2%** 3 = **30.6%** 4 & 5 = **47.3%**

3. In general,
   teachers are well prepared for change . . . . . teachers are unprepared for change
   1 & 2 = **25.0%** 3 = **36.1%** 4 & 5 = **38.9%**

4. In general,
   teachers are in control of change . . . . . teachers are not in control of change
   1 & 2 = **13.9%** 3 = **19.4%** 4 & 5 = **66.6%**

5. In general,
   change has made teaching more satisfying . . . . . change has made teaching less satisfying
   1 & 2 = **30.5%** 3 = **33.3%** 4 & 5 = **36.1%**

6. In general,
   change has enhanced teachers' professionalism . . . . . change has detracted from teachers' professionalism
   1 & 2 = **22.2%** 3 = **50.0%** 4 & 5 = **27.8%**

7. In general,
   change has had a positive impact on time allocation and use . . . . . change has had a negative impact on time allocation and use
   1 & 2 = **16.7%** 3 = **33.3%** 4 & 5 = **50.0%**

8. I anticipate that
   change in the years ahead will transform the work lives of teachers . . . . . change in the years ahead will have only a minute effect on the work lives of teachers
   1 & 2 = **80.5%** 3 = **11.1%** 4 & 5 = **8.4%**

(N = 36)

TABLE FIVE

A Comparison of Newer and More Experienced Teachers

For Selected Questions Using Collapsed Categories

3. In general,
teachers are well prepared for change ..... teachers are unprepared for change

(I) Newer Teachers (1 - 10 years)

1 & 2 = **25.0%** 3 = **36.1%** 4 & 5 = **38.9%**

(ii) More Experienced Teachers (11 - 40 years)

1 & 2 = **22.3%** 3 = **21.3%** 4 & 5 = **56.4%**

5. In general,
change has made teaching more satisfying ..... change has made teaching less satisfying

(I) Newer Teachers (1 - 10 years)

1 & 2 = **30.5%** 3 = **33.3%** 4 & 5 = **36.1%**

(ii) More Experienced Teachers (11 - 40 years)

1 & 2 = **14.9%** 3 = **26.6%** 4 & 5 = **58.5%**

REFERENCES

Birch, Daniel R. & Murray Elliott. "Towards a New Conception of Teacher Education," in Leonard L. Stewin & Stewart J. H. McCann, eds. *Contemporary Educational Issues: The Canadian Mosaic*, 2nd ed. Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman, 1993.

Churchill, Rick & John Williamson. "Educational Change and the New Realities of Teachers' Work Lives: Australian Perspectives." Paper presented to the American Education Research Association annual conference in Chicago, 1997.

Clark, W. G. & W. Aldis Wright, eds. *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*. New York: Doubleday, n.d.

Fullan, Michael. *The Meaning of Educational Change*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1982.

Fullan, Michael & Andy Hargreaves, eds. *Teacher Development and Educational Change*. London: Falmer Press, 1992.

Geddis, Art & Barry Onslow. "Teaching and Learning about Teaching: Articulating a Knowledge Base for Teacher Education." *CSSE News*, Vol. XXIV No. 1, May 1997.

Hargreaves, Andy. "Experience Counts, Theory Doesn't: How Teachers Talk About Their Work." *Sociology of Education: A Journal of Research in Socialization and Social Structure*, Vol. 57 No. 4, October 1984.

Mandzuk, David. "Beyond Knowledge and Mythology in Teacher Education," in Lance W. Roberts & Rodney A. Clifton, eds. *Crosscurrents: Contemporary Canadian Educational Issues*. Scarborough: Nelson Canada, 1995.

Roberts, Lance W. & Rodney A. Clifton. Authors' Introduction to Issue Eleven, *Crosscurrents: Contemporary Canadian Educational Issues*. Scarborough: Nelson Canada, 1995.

Taylor, Gerald D. & Peter J. Miller. "Professional Course Work and the Practicum: Do Good Students Make Good Teachers?" *Canadian Journal of Education*, Vol. 10 No. 2, Spring 1985.

Toffler, Alvin. *Future Shock*. New York: Random House, 1970.

Wright, Don. "Interview: Michael Fullan." *Education Forum*, Summer 1993.